Remarks

I reviewed the comments in the Office Action Summary. The following is a list of answers to the rejections, corresponding to the numbering system used in the Office Action Summary.

1

Claims 14-23, 25-27, 30 were rejected for being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

These claims are various forms of the Asynchronous Hyperlink Object (AHO). These different forms of the AHO should now be clearer, based on the clarification of the first claim, which explains the AHO more precisely.

I changed the "whereby" to "wherein".

I changed "affinity rules" to "a set of pre-defined rules". Affinity in this case meant similar or related.

2 – 10

Claims 1-6, 26, 27, and 30 were rejected for having been anticipated by Allard et al. in patent # 6,018,619.

Allard describes a system for tracking client activity when connected to a server. This is a passive system, which is different from the AHO described in my patent. When a client clicks on an AHO and the information requested is not immediately available, agents are created for the client and server involved in the transaction. These agents are autonomous and do not need further intervention by the client. These agents are responsible for keeping track of the request made by the client even when the client goes on to other tasks and is connecting to other servers. Allard's invention is orthogonal to my invention, as my invention provides information to the client while Allard's tracks client activity.

11 – 19

Claims 7-13, and 23-25 are rejected based on Allard and Yanagihara et al. (patent # 5,715,443).

Yanagihara describes icons related to searches in a data processing system. AHOs are a new form of hyperlink, and I must claim icons for these new hyperlinks in the context of AHOs.

20 – 26

Claims 14 – 20 are rejected based on Allard and Subramanian et al. (patent # 5,694,547).

Subramanian describes a system for registering clients and describes various responses within that context. AHOs are hyperlinks, and I must claim various responses to the client for these new hyperlinks in the context of AHOs.

27 – 28

Claims 21 – 23 are rejected based on Allard and Leighton et al. (patent application # 2002/0124080).

Leighton describes a system for routing client requests based on calculated response times of servers. AHOs deal with data that may not be available at the time of the request.

29 – 30

Claims 28 – 29 are rejected based on Allard and Vange et al. (patent application # 2002/0004796A1).

Vange describes a system in which an intermediary server is used to prioritize requests and find substitutes for requested data. AHOs describe a system in which the data is delivered from the server, but at a later time. AHOs are hyperlinks, and I must claim a system for prioritizing requests in the context of AHOs.

31 – 37

Claims 31 – 38 are rejected based on Allard and Burdick et al. (patent # 5,625,816).

Burdick describes a system in which data is gathered in a standard format in a database and delivered to clients on request and includes various means of terminating a request. I must claim various means of terminating AHOs in the context of my new form of hyperlink.